A — Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—

(*a*) 10,437.

(*b*) 4,193 without buildings. There are no schools without teachers.

(*c*) Information is being collected.

Improvement of the feeder channel of Bukkapatna Tank, Sira Taluk.

Q.—350 Sri B. C. NANJUNDAIYA (Kora).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) when the estimate was prepared for improving the feeder channel of Bukkapatna Tank, Sira Taluk;

(*b*) whether the same has been sanctioned ?

A.— Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—

(*a*) August 1950.

(*b*) Not yet.

Motion *re.* Privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have received notice of a privilege motion by Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy which runs as follows: :—

> "This House views the hanging of the portrait of the Rajpramukh in the Assembly Hall as a breach of privilege."

Without going into the merits of the case, I would like to call upon Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy to state his views regarding the admissibility of this motion.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—Rule 173 (1) reads as follows:—

> "Any member of the Assembly may draw attention to a matter of privilege by handing to the Speaker a written motion to that effect."

ಮೊನ್ನೆ ತಾನೇ ಸಭಾನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ, ನಾವು ಭಾರತ ಸಂವಿಧಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಧಕ್ಕಿನಿಷ್ಠೆಯಿಂದಿರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಪ್ರತಿಜ್ಞೆವಚನ ಸ್ವೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅವರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಾವು ಪ್ರತ್ಯಕ್ಷವಾಗಿಯಾಗಲಿ ಪರೋಕ್ಷವಾಗಿಯಾಗಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗೆ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಭಕ್ತಿ ನಿಷ್ಠೆ ಇದೆ, ಗೌರವವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ತೋರಿಸಲು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ, ಸ್ಥಾನವಿಲ್ಲ. ಭಾರತ ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಭಾವಚಿತ್ರ ಕೂಡ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈರೀತಿ ಭಾವಚಿತ್ರವನ್ನಿಟ್ಟಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹಕ್ಕಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಂತಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಮೊಷನ್ ಆಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ ಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕರು (ಮೊಳಕಾಲ್ಮೂರು).—ನಮ್ಮ ಮಿತ್ರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮುಲ್ಕ ಗೋವಿಂದ ರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು ಭಾರತ ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಭಾವ ಚಿತ್ರವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗಿ ನೋಡಿರಲಾರರು; ಯಾರೋ ಹೇಳಿದು ದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿರಬಹುದೆಂದು ತೋರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾನು ಕಂಡಂತೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಲೈಫ್ ಸೈಜ್, ಎಂದರೆ, ಆರಡಿ ಉದ್ದವಿರುವ ಭಾವ ಚಿತ್ರ ವನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವನ್ನು ನಾನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ, ಅವರು ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್, ಮೋಷನ್ ತರಬಹುದೆಂಬ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸಕ್ಕ ತಿದಿರೇ ಹೊರತು, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಗೆ breach of privilege ಇದೆ, ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೈಸೂರು, ವೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಗೌನರರ capacity ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಹಾರಾಜರು ರಾಜಪ್ರಮುಖರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಎಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ರಾಜಪ್ರಮುಖರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ವರೆಗೆ ಅವರ ಭಾವಚಿತ್ರವನ್ನಿಡಬಹುದು. ಅವರ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವರಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Sir, I may explain at the outset that as a Party we are not for this Privilege Motion. (Applause).

(ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಧ್ವನಿಗಳು).

ನಾವು ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯಾಗಿ ಈ ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಯ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ಪರವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವೂ, ಕಮ್ಯುನಿಸ್ಟರೂ ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟರೂ ಸೇರಿದಾಗ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು ಬಂದವು. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ರಾಜ ಪ್ರಮುಖರ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ, ಮಹಾರಾಜರ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೂ ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೂ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಬಂತು. ಆಗ ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರರಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರೇ ವಿನಾ ಬಾಕಿಯವರಲ್ಲ.

When we affiliated ourselves there was an understanding between us that so far as these questions are concerned, we will have freedom. So as a Party we are not for this particular motion.

ಪ್ರಥಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ಪಕ್ಷಗಳು ಸೇರುವಾಗ ಇಂಥಾ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ, ಸುಧಾರಿಸಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬೇಕು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ವಿರಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ.

I am sorry for this unfortunate position.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home Affairs and Agriculture).—We sympathise with you.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I have placed the facts before you. This is a matter for you to deal with. So far as this privilege motion is concerned, I have already explained that it is the concern of the Socialist Members and we are not for it.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK—Sir, in view of this, is it not right that the recognition granted to that party should be withdrawn and Janab Imam should be called as Janab Imam and not the Leader of the Opposition and Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy called as Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy and not as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition ? If there is difference between members of the same party, is it not better to withdraw recognition ?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I am raising a point of order, Sir. This is irrelevant to the point at issue. The point at issue is whether the motion that I have placed before this House should be discussed or whether it should not be discussed. That is the point on which he should talk. He has no business, if I may use that expression, to bring into discussion matters which are not consistent with the present motion.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—That is also a privilege. It deals with the policy underlying the Opposition Party. It is a privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member, Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy raised a point of order but never stated the point. He simply made a speech and sat down.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—The recognition granted to the Opposition Party is an important privilege. In view of the statement of the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition I am seriously submitting to the Chair that the recognition granted to them will have to be withdrawn.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—That is a matter left to the Hon'ble Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the Leader of the Opposition Party say there should be no uniform policy in the party itself ?

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I think in all other respects, our party policy is uniform. (Laughter) I do not know what it is in the case of the United Democratic Front elsewhere. Even there I think it is open to the members of that party to come together on a common front with some reservations.

That is a matter left to the party itself. We have a minimum common programme on which to act and there are some points on which we are not in a position to come to an understanding because of party affiliations and other things. That is the case not only in Madras, but also everywhere else. In Madras they formed themselves into a United Front party. Even there, there is what they call a minimum common programme and beyond this minimum common programme they have got to differ from one another. That does not mean that such differences would break the unity of the party. Here also we have a common programme and on some fundamental and basic issue which goes to the root of the party itself—for example now there is a proposal to merge socialists and K.M.P.Ps.—there are some basic principles on which without the permission of the high command or some such thing, they are not at liberty to come to an understanding and these are all matters which come under correspondence. So far as the K.M.P.P., the Socialists and the Communists are concerned, we have a minimum common programme. On some fundamental issues we have made that agreement and on others, we have agreed to differ. That is also an agreement. So I do not think, simply because we differ on some particular issue, the integrity or the solidarity of the party is in any way affected. That does not affect the status of the party and it is a matter left to the party and their internal arrangement and agreement and all such things. I submit it was an understanding that we should form ourselves into a party and on this particular issue we have not come to an understanding. It does not affect the solidarity of the party ; it does not warrant the withdrawal of the recognition,

(JANAB J. MOHAMED IMAM).

because we have set out on a common programme. You can easily understand the difficulty when so many parties come together and in all such things you must always view.....,

Mr. SPEAKER.—I quite see your difficulty.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—You must view with some generosity and give us chance to compose our differences: I have explained the fact that when we joined together, that was an understanding. On that issue I do not think there is any reason to bring about a split in the party itself.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does it not mean that on certain occasions regarding some important issue when some members of your party differ from the views held by the leader, the number of the Opposition will be reduced comparatively ?

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I submit that this is a matter left to the party. In such cases, they will take the permission of the leader and of the party wherever they can differ and come to a decision. So far as parliamentary procedure and practices are concerned, we are all one. It is on account of some basic principle, on some fundamental matter, such differences are bound to arise and we will see that in course of time such differences also are composed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Has the Leader of the House anything to say in the matter ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯನವರು (ನಭಾನಾಯಕರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಜನಾಬ್ ಮಹಮದ್ ಇಮಾಂ ರವರು ನಿರ್ಬಂಧನೆಯಿಂದ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಅವರಿಗಿರ ತಕ್ಕ ಕಷ್ಟವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಉದಾರಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾನೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲ ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಒಂದು ಸತ್ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆ ಒಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಎದುರುಪಕ್ಷದವರು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಸಾಲಭ್ಯಗಳು ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಂದು ವಾದವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಲು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಾತರವಿದೆಯೋ, ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಕಾತರತೆಯನ್ನು ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಪಾಲನೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ತೋರಿಸಬೇಕು.

Sri B. RACHIAH (Yelandur-Scheduled Castes).—On a point of order, I cannot put up with this nuisance from behind.

Sri M. SHANKERLINGE GOWDA (Nagamangala).—What is the nuisance that I have committed ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not heard him. The Leader of the House may proceed.

Janab MOHAMED IMAM.—What I submit is this. My friend has complained to the Chair that he is being troubled or harassed and is not given free scope by the gentleman sitting behind him. It is a matter for the Chair to examine the matter and hear his complaint and make him free from outside molestations.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯನವರು.—ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಎದುರುಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ, ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಒಪ್ಪಿದರೆ, ಸ್ಥಾನ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಎರಡು ನಿಯಮಗಳಿವೆ. ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳು ಒಂದು ಶಿಸ್ತಿನಿಂದ ಸಭೆಯ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವಂತೆ ಅಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಅವು.

ಮೊಟ್ಟಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷ ಹುಟ್ಟಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಅದು ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳ ತತ್ಪೂರ್ವದಲ್ಲೇ ದೇಶದ ಮುಂದೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಧ್ಯೇಯ ಧೋರಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟು ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಗೆದ್ದು ಒಂದು ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯಾಗಿ ಬಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಒಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ. ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ, ಸಭೆಗೆ ಆರಿಸಿಬಂದನಂತರ ಹಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸೇರಿಕೊಂಡು ಒಂದು ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ, ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲ ಕೂಡ ಇಂಥ ಸಾಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಎರಡು ಕಂಡಿಷನ್‌ಗಳಿರಬೇಕು. Two conditions must be fulfilled. First, the political party must have what is called a common programme and policy on the basis of which they contest elections and get elected to the House. It is only then they can claim the privilge of being the Opposition party.

ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಎದುರುಪಕ್ಷ ವಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇನೋ ನಿರ. ಆದರೆ, ಯಾರು ಇರಬೇಕು ? ಅವರು ಎಂಥವರಿರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ನಿರ್ಧಾರಮಾಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರದು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಈ ಎರಡು ಅಂತರಗಳನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಇದನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಧಾರಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಡೆಮೊಕ್ರ್ಯಾಟಿಕ್ ಯುನೈಟೆಡ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ recognition ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡಾಗ, ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ನಾನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ತರಹ ಒಂದು ಸಾಂಪ್ರದಾಯಿಕವಾದ recognitionನ್ನನ್ನು ಕೊಡಕೂಡದೆಂದು ವಾದ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಯುನೈಟೆಡ್ ಡೆಮೊಕ್ರಾಟಿಕ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥ ಯಾವ ಪಾಲಿಸಿ ಗಾಗಲೀ ಅಥವಾ

ಪ್ರೋಗ್ರಾಂ ಆಗಲಿ ಯಾವುದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಜನಾಬ್ ಇಮಾಂರವರು ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಉದಾರಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಲು ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಸದುದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ನಾನು ಈ ತಕರಾರುಗಳಾವುವನ್ನೂ ಮಾನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ಒಂದು ಶಿಸ್ತಿನಿಂದ ನಡೆದು, ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಂದು ಸಹಜನಗೆ ಬಂದು, ದೇಶಸೇವೆ ಆಗಲಿ ಎಂಬ ಸದುದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದಲೇ ನಾನು ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕ ನೀತಿ, ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಧವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶಿಸಲು ತಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಸಾಮಗ್ರಿಗಳಿವೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇದರ ಕೊನೆಯ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ಚಿತ್ತಕ್ಕೇ ಬಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಎರಡನೆಯ ವಿಷಯ ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸಭೆಯು—ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಯು—ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನಾದರೂ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಯಾರಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಮುಲ್ಕ ಗೋವಿಂದರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರೂ ನಾವೂ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಸಾರಿ ಒಗ್ಗಟ್ಟಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಧಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹೋರಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕೂ ನನ್ನ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕೂ ಯಾವ ಬೇಧವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ತರುವಾಗ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಸಮಂಜಸತೆಯಿದೆಯೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ವಿಮರ್ಶಿಸಬೇಕು. ಹಿಂದೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ನಮಗೆ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗವು ಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಆ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗಕ್ಕನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಅದರ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಮಾಡುವ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ವಿದೆಯೆ, ಇಲ್ಲವೆ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಿ ಅನಂತರ ನಾವು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಚಿತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರದು, ಒಂದು ರಾಜಪ್ರಮುಖರದು. ಈ ಎರಡು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಡಾ॥ ರಾಜೇಂದ್ರ ಪ್ರಸಾದ್ ರವರ ಚಿತ್ರವನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರಾಜಪ್ರಮುಖರ ಚಿತ್ರವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಇದು ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗಕ್ಕೂ, ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಕ್ಕೂ, ಕಾನೂನಿಗೂ ಅನುಸಾರವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗ ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೆದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿ ತೋರಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಕ್ಕು ಭಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವುದಕ್ಕೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ, ಅಸಮಂಜಸತೆ ಕೂಡ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದೇ ನನ್ನ ಅರಿಕೆ. ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಓದಿ ನೋಡಲಿ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಚಿತ್ರಗಳಿವೆ. ಆ ಎರಡು ಚಿತ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಚಿತ್ರದ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆ ಸೂಚನೆ ತಂದರೆ ಅದು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ತೆಗೆದರೆ ಎರಡನ್ನೂ ತೆಗೆಯಬೇಕು, ಇಟ್ಟರೆ ಎರಡನ್ನೂ ಇಡಬೇಕು.

Rajpramukh is the head of the State constitutionally and the President is the head of the whole of India. There I do not see any privilege that is either breached or attempted to be breached. If my friend convinces me that there is some breach of the privilege, as I have already stated, I will be the first to lend my support irrespective of the benches on which we sit.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are of course certain principles on which a party of a Legislature can be recognised. I will look into this matter. I gave recognition to the party for the simple reason that I thought that all the Members who sent that requisition had a uniform policy. The present situation requires serious consideration and will be treated as a separate issue.

So far as the privilege motion is concerned, Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy has drawn attention to Rule 173. Under Rule 173 (4) of our Rules of Procedure, the Speaker has to first decide whether a privilege motion handed in by a member involves a *prima facie* case of privilege before any further action could be taken in the matter. When Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy handed in his motion of privilege, I had to decide whether a *prima facie* case of privilege was involved. As was not convinced that any question of privilege arose in the circumstances set out in the motion, I wanted to give the Member and the other Members also a chance to convince me on this point. I have now heard the mover and als the other Members.

Parliamentary privilege has been defined as the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by the House collectively and by the members of each House individually without which they cannot discharge their functions and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals. The basis and test for a Privilege is that it should be a right which is absolutely necessary for the due execution of the powers of the House. It is enjoyed because the House cannot perform its functions nor can the services of its members be available without exercise of the privilege.

If we turn to the Constitution under which we function as has been pointed out by the Leader of the House, we see that a Legislature is stated to

(MR. SPEAKER)

consist of the Rajpramukh and the two Houses in Mysore (Article 168 read with Article 238). The Rajpramukh that is, His Highness is an integral part of our State Legislature and the fact that the portrait of the Rajpramukh is in the Legislative Assembly Hall cannot involve or raise any question of privilege whatsoever. On these grounds I hold that no *prima facie* case of privilege has been made out.

MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT.

Withholding of results of certain students of Intermediate and other Colleges.

MR. SPEAKER.—There is an adjournment motion sent by the same member, Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy. It reads as follows .—

> "This Assembly do now stand adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance and of recent occurrence, namely, the withholding of results of Intermediate students of the Intermediate College, Chitaldrug and of students of some other Colleges of the Mysore University due to shortage of attendance."

I now call upon the concerned Minister if he is prepared to make a statement or give an explanation so as to convince the House.

SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—Sir, I wish to make only a few remarks. This is a matter which pertains to the Mysore University, which is a Statutory Body. The Mysore University held a series of examinations and the results of thousands of students were published. I know that in about a dozen cases, the results have been withheld. While the results of about 15,000 students were announced, the results of only a dozen students are withheld. The adjournment motion states that the results of Intermediate students of the Intermediate College, Chitaldrug and of the students of some other colleges are withheld. It is not at all so big as stated in the motion.

Next, as I submitted, the University is a Statutory Body which has been set up and is functioning because of the Law behind it which has had the sanction of the Legislature. I learn that this question of withholding the results of these few students is engaging the attention of the University Council and they are going into this matter on the 29th of this month. Under the circumstances, I have to submit that to encroach upon the functions of a Statutory Body as the University, is neither proper nor fair to the Legislature and I am sure that the University will look into the matter with sympathy and consider the cases of these students, consistent with the morale and dignity attached to the University. With these few words, I submit that this motion is not proper.

1-30 P. M.

SRI A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molakalmuru).—In this connection I wish to state that I beg to differ from the Hon'ble Member. To say that no adjournment motion should be brought on any matter connected with the University affairs is denying the right and privilege of a Member in this House. Though it might be a Statutory Body every pie of it has been paid by this House and when it involves financial matters, we have a right to question any act of that Body. But the statement made by the Hon'ble Minister that the question will be considered sympathetically and the fact that the University Council meets on the 29th, may be taken into consideration by the Chair in deciding this issue. But so far as the bringing of an adjournment motion is concerned, it is perfectly within the right of any Member to do so. Secondly, merely because the results of 15,000 have been announced, it does not give any right to withhold the results of some students. What is the student to do ? Is he going to join the next class ? He is in the wilderness. He is in the midsky or Viswamitra's Trisankuswarga.